

REMARKS

1. Status of Claims

Claims 1-19 were pending in the Application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 7-9, 13 and 16 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have added new claim 20. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 will remain pending in the application.

2. Claim Objections

In section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected claim 7-9, 13 and 16 for formalities. Applicants appreciate the indications of typographical errors and have amended the claims for cosmetic reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

3. Rejections under 35 USC § 112

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as the element “processing an update ...” is definite and clear. An update is processed if the data collection segregation rules are not current and that element is then complete. Without limiting the scope of the claim to any particular order, and solely for illustrative purposes, in one possible configuration, the process then proceeds to the next step.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

4. Rejections under 35 USC § 102

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. (“Reisinger ‘292”).

Initially, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the reference including an apparent indication of inherent subject matter that is disputed. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite several limitations found in allowable claim 8 and the rejection is moot. Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons discussed with reference to the independent and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1-3 and 5-6.

5. Rejections under 35 USC § 103

In section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. ("Reisinger '292").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 and thus dependent claims 4 and 7 are patentable for at least the same reasons described above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 4 and 7.

6. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowability of the subject matter of dependent claims 8-19. Dependent claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitation of the base claim and is thus allowable. Similarly, dependent claims 9-19 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

Applicant respectfully submit that new claim 20 includes several limitations of allowed claim 8 and is patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as presently claimed in claims 1-20 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

7. Conclusion Of Remarks

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

8. Authorization

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-388-O1.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-388-O1.

Respectfully submitted,

/George M. Macdonald/

George M. Macdonald
Reg. No. 39,284
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone (203) 924-3180
PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000